



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/688,668	10/17/2003	Gregg L. Shedd	TN-3305	2621
7590 Black & Decker Inc. 701 E. Joppa Road, TW-199 Towson, MD 21286		EXAMINER LEE, LAURA MICHELLE		
		ART UNIT 3724		
		MAIL DATE 07/18/2011		
		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/688,668

Applicant(s)

SHEDDY ET AL.

Examiner

LAURA LEE

Art Unit

3724

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,66-69,71,80,81 and 83-86 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,5,66-69,71,80,81 and 83-86 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 5/5/2011 in which claims 1, 3, 5, 66-69, 71, 80-81, 83-86 are pending, claim 86 is new and claim 85 is amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5 and 85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,347,624), herein referred to as Smith in view of Tsao (U.S. Patent 6,263,866) and in further view of Greenland (U.S. Patent 6,276,990).

Smith discloses a saw comprising: a base (100) formed as a tub; a frame assembly (300) disposed on the base; a first rail (310; fig. 7) disposed on the frame assembly (300), the first rail (310) having a longitudinal axis; a saw assembly (500) disposed on at least one of the base and the frame assembly, the saw assembly comprising a support assembly (400), a motor assembly (500) and a cutting wheel (fig. 1) driven by the motor assembly, the cutting wheel having a plane substantially parallel to the pivot axis; a table (210) slidingly disposed on the first rail through at least one set of wheels (290/291; fig. 4) and mounted to an underside thereof, so as to be movable

relative to the saw assembly in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis; wherein one of the frame assembly and the support assembly has a first post, and the other of the frame assembly and the support assembly has a first hole for receiving the first post; and one of the frame assembly and the support assembly has a second post and the other of the frame assembly and the support assembly has a second hole for receiving the second post (see the two screws/bolts not numbered in Fig.1 attaching the arm 400 to the frame and also the longitudinal post in Figure 10, near ref. 420, where the tube 450 comes out), wherein the first rail (310) has a first end, and the table and the at least one set of wheels are movable beyond the first end (through slots 110 in the base 100; see Figs. 2 and 9A-C).

Smith does not disclose that the rail is adjustable in a direction lateral to the longitudinal axis that the motor assembly pivotally supported by the support assembly, the support assembly remaining stationary relative to pivotal movement of the motor assembly and the motor assembly being pivotable about a pivot axis substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis and a switch electrically connected to the motor assembly and disposed above the table and proximate to the motor assembly. In regards to the adjustable rail, attention is further directed to the Tsao reference. Tsao also discloses a tile cutter with a rail system for moving a table and workpiece towards and away from the cutting blade. Tsao discloses designing the rail system to be adjustable by utilizing a plurality of transverse screw holes to attach the rails to the frame (col. 2, lines 7-12). It is well known that the elongated holes allow the rail to be slid in a lateral direction to correct for variances in machining tolerances and overall

improvement in performance. It similarly would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated elongated screw holes with the Smith rail and frame system to provide for the adjustability of the rails, allowing for an improvement in the engagement of the table wheels and the rails and thus the control of the workpiece during cutting.

The modified device of Smith still does not teach a saw where the motor assembly is pivotally supported by the support assembly, the support assembly remaining stationary relative to pivotal movement of the motor assembly and the motor assembly being pivotable about a pivot axis substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis and a switch electrically connected to the motor assembly and disposed above the table and proximate to the motor assembly. The first claim limitations read on a motor assembly that is pivotable to create bevel cuts in the workpiece, and the support assembly is stationary during the movement of the saw blade. Attention is directed to the Greenland tile saw. Greenland discloses an alternative configuration for the saw assembly, in which the saw assembly is positioned on a U-shaped frame, such that the saw and the motor assembly are pivotable in order to position the blade to make bevel cuts in the workpiece. Bevel cuts are well known in the cutting arts for chamfering and angular cutting of the workpiece for example for fitting tile pieces about corners and other not 180-degree surfaces. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted or modified the cutting assembly of Lee for the cutting assembly of Greenland to allow for movement of the saw blade relative to the support assembly as taught by Greenland for the similar

benefit of increasing the versatility of the cutting tool by allowing for angular cuts to be created in the workpiece. Although there must be a switch on the Smith saw to power on and off the motor, Smith does not disclose its location and therefore does not disclose that it is disposed above the table and proximate to the motor assembly. However, again, Greenland discloses providing the switch (28) on the motor, which is a common location for the power switch. It similarly would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated the switch on the Smith motor as taught by Greenland to power on and off the motor during use of the assembly.

In regards to claim 2, the modified device of Smith discloses wherein the first rail (310) has a first end, and the table (210) is movable beyond the first end (Fig. 9C).

In regards to claim 3, the modified device of Smith discloses wherein the table (210) is movable beyond the base (300) (Fig. 9C).

In regards to claim 5, the modified device of Smith discloses wherein the rail is aluminum (col. 5, lines 62-65).

In regards to claim 85, the modified device of Smith discloses wherein the first post (screw) has a different width from that of the second post (longitudinal rod near 420 in fig. 10, from which tube 450 emerges).

4. Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,347,624), herein referred to as Smith in view of Tsao (U.S. Patent 6,263,866) and in further view of Greenland (U.S. Patent 6,276,990) and in further view of Sigetich et al. (U.S. Patent 4,428,159) The modified device of Smith discloses the

claimed invention except is silent as to the type of switch and therefore does not appear to disclose that the switch comprises a single throw, double pole switch (i.e. a toggle switch). However, attention is directed to the Sigetich tile saw cutter which utilizes a toggle switch (51) to energize and de-energize the motor 31 and the pump 53 at the same time. As toggle switches are old and well known in the art for providing on/off connections, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have utilized a toggle switch in the modified device of Smith to turning the power on/off.

5. Claim 80 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,347,624), herein referred to as Smith in view of Tsao (U.S. Patent 6,263,866) and in further view of Greenland (U.S. Patent 6,276,990) and in further view of Lee (U.S. Patent 5,676,124), Jameson (3,777,792), Weissman (4,885,965), Mayfield (5,063,806), Rueb (5,577,428), Welch (5,906,538), and Gorgol et al (6,273,081). In regards to claim 80, the modified device of Smith discloses wherein the support assembly comprises a support member (420; fig. 10) disposed on at least one of the base and the frame assembly and a generally U-shaped member (410) coupled to the support member (420). The modified device of Smith does not disclose that the switch is on the generally U-shaped member. However, attention is also directed to the Lee, Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb, Welch, Greenland, and Gorgol et al. references. These references are cited as cumulative evidence that it is well known in the art to locate the power switch for a cutting tool almost anywhere on a saw. Thus, even though the specific location of the switch that Applicant is claiming is not specifically

taught, the indication from the prior art is that the location of the switch would have been an obvious matter of design choice dependent on the suitability of that location for whatever desired reason, such as dexterity, eye coordination, or standing position of the operator, ease of manufacturing, or position of the work piece and/or product.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a switch on the saw as claimed, such as on the u-shaped member (420), as suggested by Lee, Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb, Welch, Greenland, and Gorgol et al. on the Smith device in order to accommodate dexterity, eye coordination, or standing position of the operator, ease of manufacturing, or position of the workpiece and/or product. In addition, it is also noted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the switch in an alternative location in order to accommodate dexterity, eye coordination, or standing position of the operator, ease of manufacturing, or position of the work piece and/or product since it has been held the shifting of parts to different positions is a known variable. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

6. Claims 67-68, 83 and 84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,347,624), herein referred to as Smith in view of Tsao (U.S. Patent 6,263,866) and of Greenland (U.S. Patent 6,276,990) and in further view of Lee (U.S. Patent 5,676,124), Jameson (3,777,792), Weissman (4,885,965), Mayfield (5,063,806), Rueb (5,577,428), Welch (5,906,538), and Gorgol et al (6,273,081). In regards to claims 67 and 68, Smith discloses a saw comprising: a

base (100); a frame assembly (300) disposed on the base; a first rail (310) disposed on the frame assembly, the first rail having a longitudinal axis; a table (210) slidingly disposed on the first rail through at least one set of wheels (290/291) mounted to an underside thereof, the table being movable in a direction substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis; a saw assembly (500) disposed on at least one of the base and the frame assembly, the saw assembly comprising a support assembly (400), a motor assembly (500) pivotally supported by the support assembly (400), and a cutting wheel (not numbered) driven by the motor assembly, the cutting wheel having a plane substantially parallel to a bevel axis; and wherein the support assembly comprises a support member (420) disposed on at least one of the base and the frame assembly and a generally U-shaped member (410) having first and second legs (the two sections of the U) and wherein the first rail(310) has a first end (Fig. 9C), and the table (210) and the at least one set of wheels (290/291) are movable beyond the first end (see at least Figs. 9A-9C).

Smith does not disclose that the rail is adjustable in a direction lateral to the longitudinal axis that the motor assembly pivotally supported by the support assembly, the support assembly remaining stationary relative to pivotal movement of the motor assembly and the motor assembly being pivotable about a pivot axis substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis and a switch electrically connected to the motor assembly and disposed on the support assembly so that, when the motor assembly is pivoted about the bevel axis, the switch remains stationary, and the switch is disposed on the U-shaped member.

In regards to the adjustable rail, attention is further directed to the Tsao reference. Tsao also discloses a tile cutter with a rail system for moving a table and workpiece towards and away from the cutting blade. Tsao discloses designing the rail system to be adjustable by utilizing a plurality of transverse screw holes to attach the rails to the frame (col. 2, lines 7-12). It is well known that the elongated holes allow the rail to be slid in a lateral direction to correct for variances in machining tolerances and overall improvement in performance. It similarly would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated elongated screw holes with the Smith rail and frame system to provide for the adjustability of the rails, allowing for an improvement in the engagement of the table wheels and the rails and thus the control of the workpiece during cutting.

The modified device of Smith still does not teach a saw where the motor assembly is pivotally supported by the support assembly, the support assembly remaining stationary relative to pivotal movement of the motor assembly and the motor assembly being pivotable about a pivot axis substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis and a switch electrically connected to the motor assembly and disposed above the table and proximate to the motor assembly. The first claim limitations read on a motor assembly that is pivotable to create bevel cuts in the workpiece, and the support assembly is stationary during the movement of the saw blade. Attention is directed to the Greenland tile saw. Greenland discloses an alternative configuration for the saw assembly, in which the saw assembly is positioned on a U-shaped frame, such that the saw and the motor assembly are pivotable in order to position the blade to make bevel

cuts in the workpiece. Bevel cuts are well known in the cutting arts for chamfering and angular cutting of the workpiece for example for fitting tile pieces about corners and other not 180-degree surfaces. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted or modified the cutting assembly of Lee for the cutting assembly of Greenland to allow for movement of the saw blade relative to the support assembly as taught by Greenland for the similar benefit of increasing the versatility of the cutting tool by allowing for angular cuts to be created in the workpiece.

Although there must be a switch on the Smith saw to power on and off the motor, Smith does not disclose its location and therefore does not disclose that it is disposed on the support assembly so that, when the motor assembly is pivoted about the bevel axis, the switch remains stationary, and the switch is disposed on the U-shaped member. However, attention is also directed to the Lee, Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb, Welch, Greenland, and Gorgol et al. references. These references are cited as cumulative evidence that it is well known in the art to locate the power switch for a cutting tool almost anywhere on a saw. Thus, even though the specific location of the switch that Applicant is claiming is not specifically taught, the indication from the prior art is that the location of the switch would have been an obvious matter of design choice dependent on the suitability of that location for whatever desired reason, such as dexterity, eye coordination, or standing position of the operator, ease of manufacturing, or position of the work piece and/or product. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a switch

on the saw as claimed, such as on the u-shaped member (420), as suggested by Lee, Jameson, Weissman, Mayfield, Rueb, Welch, Greenland, and Gorgol et al. on the Smith device in order to accommodate dexterity, eye coordination, or standing position of the operator, ease of manufacturing, or position of the workpiece and/or product. In addition, it is also noted that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the switch in an alternative location in order to accommodate dexterity, eye coordination, or standing position of the operator, ease of manufacturing, or position of the work piece and/or product since it has been held the shifting of parts to different positions is a known variable. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950).

In regards to claim 68, the modified device of Smith discloses wherein the motor assembly is pivotally supported by first and second legs of the U-shaped member (i.e. Smith 400 or Greenland 16)

In regards to claim 83 and 84, the modified device of Smith discloses wherein the switch is disposed on the support assembly so that when the motor assembly is pivoted (bevel angle as modified) about the bevel axis, the support assembly and the switch remain stationary relative to the pivotal movement of the motor assembly.

7. Claim 69 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsao in view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,347,624), herein referred to as Smith in view of Tsao (U.S. Patent 6,263,866) and of Greenland (U.S. Patent 6,276,990) and in further view of Lee (U.S. Patent 5,676,124), Jameson (3,777,792), Weissman (4,885,965), Mayfield

(5,063,806), Rueb (5,577,428), Welch (5,906,538), and Gorgol et al (6,273,081) and in further view of McCambridge et al. (U. S. Patent 4,350,193), herein referred to as McCambridge, Marcoux et al. (U.S. Patent 3,342,226) Brenta (U.S. Patent 4,105,055), Sanfillipo (U.S. Patent 6,745,803) and Otto (U.S. Patent 5,161,590). The modified device of Smith discloses the use of an electrical plug to power the saw from a wall outlet, but not disclose that the end of the plug/cord is instead terminated at an electrical outlet. However, attention is directed to the McCambridge, Marcoux, Brenta, Sanfillipo and Otto reference that all discloses work tables with directly incorporated outlets. These references are cited as cumulative evidence that it is well known in the art to utilize an outlet on a worktable such as shown by Greenland instead of directly engaging the power tool with an AC wall outlet. The outlets provide available and convenient electrical power for utilization with a plurality of tools at the same time, such that only a single cord is required to run to the wall outlet, instead of two cords to operate both the pump and the motor of the saw. It similarly would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated an outlet into the Smith support instead of the plug as taught by McCambridge, Marcoux, Brenta, Sanfillipo and Otto to minimize the number of cords to power the pump and saw motor plugged into a wall outlet or to power additional tool attachments.

8. Claim 81 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,347,624), herein referred to as Smith in view of Tsao (U.S. Patent 6,263,866) and of Greenland (U.S. Patent 6,276,990) and in further view of Lee (U.S.

Patent 5,676,124), Jameson (3,777,792), Weissman (4,885,965), Mayfield (5,063,806), Rueb (5,577,428), Welch (5,906,538), and Gorgol et al (6,273,081) and in further view of Sigetich et al. (U.S. Patent 4,428,159) The modified device of Smith discloses the claimed invention except is silent as to the type of switch and therefore does not appear to disclose that the switch comprises a single throw, double pole switch (i.e. a toggle switch). However, attention is directed to the Sigetich tile saw cutter which utilizes a toggle switch (51) to energize and de-energize the motor 31 and the pump 53 at the same time. As toggle switches are old and well known in the art for providing on/off connections, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have utilized a toggle switch in the modified device of Smith to turning the power on/off.

9. Claim 86 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. (U.S. Patent 6,347,624), herein referred to as Smith in view of Tsao (U.S. Patent 6,263,866) and in further view of Greenland (U.S. Patent 6,276,990).

In regards to claim 86, the modified device of Smith discloses the claimed invention except wherein the posts (screws/ longitudinal rod near 420 in fig. 10) have a longitudinal axis parallel to the plane of the cutting wheel. However, it is also noted that the arm 410 wraps on top of the rail as best shown in Figures 1 and 10. At the time the invention was made, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add two additional screws or relocated the two horizontal screws to secure the arm to the rail from the top rather than from the sides as an additional or alternative securement location because Applicant does not disclose that

the post orientation provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose or solves a stated problem. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added two additional screws or relocated the two horizontal screws to secure the arm to the rail from the top rather than from the sides as an additional or alternative securement location. One of ordinary skill in the art would have expected Smiths' screw connection and applicant's invention to perform equally well with longitudinal screw connection as taught by Smith or vertical post connection as claimed because both screws perform the same function of securely attaching the body to the rails. Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to modify Smith to obtain the invention as specified in claim 86 because such a modification would have been considered a mere design consideration which fails to patentably distinguish over the prior art of Smith.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments filed 5/5/2011 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that the office did not provide a rationale to combine Smith, Tsao and Greenland to teach a motor assembly pivotably supported by the support assembly. In response to applicant's argument that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge

generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). As outlined in the previous rejection, Smith discloses a tile saw blade and motor assembly attached to a U-shaped support arm that does not pivot relative to the support arm. Greenland discloses another tile saw and motor assembly mounted on a similar U-shaped frame. However, Greenland discloses an alternative attachment means that allows the saw and motor to pivot relative to the workpiece which is traveling toward the blade on a traveling work table. Greenland also provides for the movement of the saw blade to an angled position for making beveled cuts that are well known in the art. Many saws are already known for this feature; table saws, miter saws, portable circular saws, etc., are all known to pivot to provide for a bevel cutting orientation. This cut is well known in chamfering, beveling, routing and overlapping and grooving the workpieces. Applying the known technique of angling the saw blade and motor relative to the workpiece provides a well established and predictable result of a bevel cut, among other benefits, which was set forth in the motivation of the prior rejection.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAURA LEE whose telephone number is (571)272-8339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer Ashley can be reached on (571) 272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/688,668
Art Unit: 3724

Page 17

/Laura M Lee/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724
7/14/2011